

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN DIFFEOMORPHISM GROUPS AND SINGULAR FOLIATIONS

TOMASZ RYBICKI

ABSTRACT. It is well-known that any isotopically connected diffeomorphism group G of a manifold determines uniquely a singular foliation $\mathcal{F}_G$. A one-to-one correspondence between the class of singular foliations and a subclass of diffeomorphism groups is established. As an illustration of this correspondence it is shown that the commutator subgroup $[G, G]$ of an isotopically connected, factorizable and non-fixing C^r -diffeomorphism group G is simple iff the foliation $\mathcal{F}_{[G, G]}$ defined by $[G, G]$ admits no proper minimal sets. In particular, the compactly supported e -component of the leaf preserving C^∞ -diffeomorphism group of a regular foliation $\mathcal{F}$ is simple iff $\mathcal{F}$ has no proper minimal sets.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout by a *foliation* we mean a singular foliation (Sussmann [17], Stefan [15]), and by a *regular foliation* we mean a foliation whose leaves have the same dimension. Introducing the notion of foliations, Sussmann and Stefan emphasized that they play a role of collections of "accessible" sets. Alternatively, they regarded foliations as integrable smooth distributions. Another point of view is to treat foliations as by-products of non-transitive geometric structures, c.f. [2], [20] and examples in [10]. In Molino's approach some types of singular foliations constitute collections of closures of leaves of certain regular foliations ([7], [21]). In this note we regard foliations as a special type of diffeomorphism groups.

Given a C^∞ smooth paracompact boundaryless manifold M , $\text{Diff}^r(M)_0$ (resp. $\text{Diff}_c^r(M)_0$), where $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, is the subgroup of the group of all C^r diffeomorphisms $\text{Diff}^r(M)$ on M consisting of diffeomorphisms that can be joined to the identity through a C^r isotopy (resp. compactly supported C^r isotopy) on M . A diffeomorphism group $G \leq \text{Diff}^r(M)$, is called *isotopically connected* if any element f of G can be joined to id_M through a C^r isotopy

Date: December 19, 2010.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 53C12, 57R50, 57R52.

Key words and phrases. Diffeomorphism group, singular foliation, commutator group, simple group, leaf preserving diffeomorphism.

Partially supported by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education and the AGH grant n. 11.420.04.

in G . That is, there is a mapping $\mathbb{R} \times M \ni (t, x) \mapsto f_t(x) \in M$ of class C^r with $f_t \in G$ for all t and such that $f_0 = \text{id}$ and $f_1 = f$. It is well-known that any isotopically connected group $G \leq \text{Diff}^r(M)_0$ defines uniquely a foliation of class C^r , designated by $\mathcal{F}_G$ (see sect. 2).

Our first aim is to establish a correspondence between the class $\mathfrak{F}^r(M)$ of all C^r -foliations on M and a subclass of diffeomorphism groups on M , and, by using it, to interpret some results and some open problems concerning non-transitive diffeomorphism groups. The second aim is to prove new results (Theorems 1.1 and 1.2) illustrating this correspondence.

A group $G \leq \text{Diff}^r(M)$ is called *factorizable* if for every open cover $\mathcal{U}$ and every $g \in G$ there are $g_1, \dots, g_r \in G$ with $g = g_1 \dots g_r$ and such that $g_i \in G_{U_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, for some $U_1, \dots, U_r \in \mathcal{U}$. Here for $U \subset M$ and $G \leq \text{Diff}^r(M)$, G_U stands for the identity component of the group of all diffeomorphisms from G compactly supported in U . Next G is said to be *non-fixing* if $G(x) \neq \{x\}$ for every $x \in X$.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $G \leq \text{Diff}_c^r(M)_0$, $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, is isotopically connected, non-fixing and factorizable group of diffeomorphisms of smooth manifold M . Then the commutator group $[G, G]$ is simple if and only if the corresponding foliation $\mathcal{F}_{[G, G]}$ admits no proper (i.e. not equal to M) minimal set.*

In early 1970's Thurston and Mather proved that the group $\text{Diff}_c^r(M)_0$, where $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, $r \neq \dim(M) + 1$, is perfect and simple (see [18], [6], [1]). Next, similar results were proved for classical diffeomorphism groups of class C^∞ ([1], [13]). For the significance of these simplicity theorems, see, e.g., [1], [13] and references therein.

Let $(M_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, be foliated manifolds. A map $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is called *foliation preserving* if $f(L_x) = L_{f(x)}$ for any $x \in M_1$, where L_x is the leaf meeting x . Next, if $(M_1, \mathcal{F}_1) = (M_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ then f is *leaf preserving* if $f(L_x) = L_x$ for all $x \in M_1$. Throughout $\text{Diff}^r(M, \mathcal{F})$ will stand for the group of all leaf preserving C^r -diffeomorphisms of a foliated manifold $(M, \mathcal{F})$. Define $\text{Diff}^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0$ and $\text{Diff}_c^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0$ analogously as above. Observe that a perfectness theorem for the compactly supported identity component $\text{Diff}_c^\infty(M, \mathcal{F})_0$, being a non-transitive counterpart of Thurston's theorem, has been proved by the author in [9] and by Tsuboi in [19]. Next, the author in [10], following Mather [6], II, showed that $\text{Diff}_c^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0$ is perfect provided $1 \leq r \leq \dim \mathcal{F}$. Observe that, in general, the group $\text{Diff}_c^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0$ is not simple for obvious reasons.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(M, \mathcal{F})$ be a foliation on a C^∞ smooth manifold M with no leaves of dimension 0. Then the commutator subgroup*

$$\mathcal{D} = [\text{Diff}_c^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0, \text{Diff}_c^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0]$$

is simple if and only if $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}$ does not have any proper minimal set. In particular, if $\mathcal{F}$ is regular, and $1 \leq r \leq \dim \mathcal{F}$ or $r = \infty$, then $\text{Diff}_c^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0$ is simple if and only if $\mathcal{F}$ has no proper minimal sets.

In the proof of Theorem 1.1 in sect. 3 some ideas from Ling [5] are in use.

2. FOLIATIONS CORRESPOND TO A SUBCLASS OF THE CLASS OF DIFFEOMORPHISM GROUPS

Let $1 \leq r \leq \infty$ and let L be a subset of a C^r -manifold M endowed with a C^r -differentiable structure which makes it an immersed submanifold. Then L is *weakly imbedded* if for any locally connected topological space N and a continuous map $f : N \rightarrow M$ satisfying $f(N) \subset L$, the map $f : N \rightarrow L$ is continuous as well. It follows that in this case such a differentiable structure is unique. A *foliation of class C^r* is a partition $\mathcal{F}$ of M into weakly imbedded submanifolds, called leaves, such that the following condition holds. If x belongs to a k -dimensional leaf, then there is a local chart (U, φ) with $\varphi(x) = 0$, and $\varphi(U) = V \times W$, where V is open in $\mathbb{R}^k$, and W is open in $\mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, such that if $L \in \mathcal{F}$ then $\varphi(L \cap U) = V \times l$, where $l = \{w \in W | \varphi^{-1}(0, w) \in L\}$. A foliation is called *regular* if all leaves have the same dimension.

Sussmann ([17]) and Stefan ([15],[16]) regarded foliations as collections of accessible sets in the following sense.

Definition 2.1. A smooth mapping φ of an open subset of $\mathbb{R} \times M$ into M is said to be a C^r -arrow, $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, if

- (1) $\varphi(t, \cdot) = \varphi_t$ is a local C^r -diffeomorphism for each t , possibly with empty domain,
- (2) $\varphi_0 = \text{id}$ on its domain,
- (3) $\text{dom}(\varphi_t) \subset \text{dom}(\varphi_s)$ whenever $0 \leq s < t$.

Given an arbitrary set of arrows $\mathcal{A}$, let $\mathcal{A}^*$ be the totality of local diffeomorphisms ψ such that $\psi = \varphi(t, \cdot)$ for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Next $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ denotes the set consisting of all local diffeomorphisms being finite compositions of elements from $\mathcal{A}^*$ or $(\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1} = \{\psi^{-1} | \psi \in \mathcal{A}^*\}$, and of the identity. Then the orbits of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ are called *accessible sets* of $\mathcal{A}$.

For $x \in M$ let $\mathcal{A}(x)$, $\bar{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ be the vector subspaces of $T_x M$ generated by

$$\{\dot{\varphi}(t, y) | \varphi \in \mathcal{A}, \varphi_t(y) = x\}, \quad \{d_y \psi(v) | \psi \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \psi(y) = x, v \in \mathcal{A}(y)\},$$

respectively. Then we have ([15])

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an arbitrary set of C^r -arrows on M . Then*

- (1) *every accessible set of $\mathcal{A}$ admits a (unique) C^r -differentiable structure of a connected weakly imbedded submanifold of M ;*
- (2) *the collection of accessible sets defines a foliation $\mathcal{F}$; and*

(3) $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F}) := \{\bar{A}(x)\}$ is the tangent distribution of $\mathcal{F}$.

Let $G \leq \text{Diff}^r(M)$ be an isotopically connected group of diffeomorphisms. Let $\mathcal{A}_G$ be the totality of restrictions of isotopies $\mathbb{R} \times M \ni (t, x) \mapsto f_t(x) \in M$ in G to open subsets of $\mathbb{R} \times M$. Then by $\mathcal{F}_G$ we denote the foliation defined by the set of arrows $\mathcal{A}_G$. Observe that $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_G = \mathcal{A}_G$ and, consequently, $\bar{A}_G(x) = \mathcal{A}_G(x)$.

Remark 2.3. (1) Of course, any subgroup $G \leq \text{Diff}^r(M)$ determines uniquely a foliation. Namely, G defines uniquely its maximal subgroup G_0 which is isotopically connected.

(2) Denote by G_c the subgroup of all compactly supported elements of G . Then G_c need not be isotopically connected even if G is so. In fact, let $G = \text{Diff}^r(\mathbb{R}^n)_0$, $1 \leq r \leq \infty$. Then every $f \in G_c$ is isotopic to the identity but the isotopy need not be in G_c . That is, G_c is not isotopically connected. Observe that the exception is the C^0 case: due to Alexander's trick for $r = 0$ (see, e.g., [3], p.70) G_c is isotopically connected.

Likewise, let $C = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1$ be the annulus and let $G = \text{Diff}^r(C)_0$. Then there is the twisting number epimorphism $T : G_c \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. It is easily seen that $f \in G_c$ is joined to id by a compactly supported isotopy iff $T(f) = 0$. Consequently, G_c is not isotopically connected.

Denote by $\mathfrak{G}^r(M)$ (resp. $\mathfrak{G}_c^r(M)$), $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, the totality of isotopically connected (resp. isotopically connected through compactly supported isotopies) groups of C^r diffeomorphisms of M . Next the symbol $\mathfrak{F}^r(M)$ will stand for the totality of foliations of class C^r on M . Then each $G \in \mathfrak{G}^r(M)$ determines uniquely a foliation from $\mathfrak{F}^r(M)$, denoted by $\mathcal{F}_G$. That is, we have the mapping $\beta_M : \mathfrak{G}^r(M) \ni G \mapsto \mathcal{F}_G \in \mathfrak{F}^r(M)$. Conversely, to any foliation $\mathcal{F} \in \mathfrak{F}^r(M)$ we assign $G_{\mathcal{F}} := \text{Diff}_c^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0$ and we get the mapping $\alpha_M : \mathfrak{F}^r(M) \ni \mathcal{F} \mapsto G_{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathfrak{G}_c^r(M)$. The following is obvious.

Proposition 2.4. *One has $\beta_M \circ \alpha_M = \text{id}_{\mathfrak{F}^r(M)}$. In particular*

$$\alpha_M : \mathfrak{F}^r(M) \ni \mathcal{F} \mapsto G_{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathfrak{G}_c^r(M)$$

is an injection identifying the class of C^r -foliations with a subclass of C^r -diffeomorphism groups.

Observe that usually $(\alpha_M \circ \beta_M)(G) \in \mathfrak{G}_c^r(M)$ is not a subgroup of G even if $G \in \mathfrak{G}_c^r(M)$. For instance, take the group of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms of a Poisson manifold, see [20]. See also examples in [11].

Remark 2.5. Note that we can also define $\alpha'_M : \mathfrak{F}^r(M) \ni \mathcal{F} \mapsto G'_{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathfrak{G}^r(M)$, where $G'_{\mathcal{F}} := \text{Diff}^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0 \in \mathfrak{G}^r(M)$, and we get another identification of the class of C^r -foliations with a subclass of C^r -diffeomorphism groups. However we prefer α_M to α'_M because of Proposition 2.11 below.

For $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathfrak{F}^r(M)$ we say that $\mathcal{F}_1$ is a *subfoliation* of $\mathcal{F}_2$ if each leaf of $\mathcal{F}_1$ is contained in a leaf of $\mathcal{F}_2$. We then write $\mathcal{F}_1 \prec \mathcal{F}_2$. By a *flag structure* we mean a finite sequence $\mathcal{F}_1 \prec \cdots \prec \mathcal{F}_k$ of foliations of M . Next, by the *intersection* of $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$ we mean the partition $\mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2 := \{L_1 \cap L_2 : L_i \in \mathcal{F}_i, i = 1, 2\}$ of M . Clearly, if $\mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2$ is a foliation then $\mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2 \prec \mathcal{F}_i, i = 1, 2$.

It is a rare phenomenon that $\mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2$ would be a regular foliation, provided $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$ are regular. In the category of (singular) foliations it may happen more often.

- Proposition 2.6.** (1) *If the distribution $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2)$ is of class C^r ([15]) then $\mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2$ is a foliation.*
(2) *If $G_1, G_2 \in \mathfrak{G}^r(M)$ have the intersection $G = G_1 \cap G_2$ isotopically connected then $\mathcal{F}_G = \mathcal{F}_{G_1} \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_{G_2}$.*
(3) *For $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathfrak{F}^r(M)$, if the intersection $\mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2$ is a foliation then there is $G \in \mathfrak{G}^r(M)$ such that $G \leq G_{\mathcal{F}_1} \cap G_{\mathcal{F}_2}$ and $\mathcal{F}_G = \mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2$.*
(4) *For $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathfrak{F}^r(M)$, if $G_{\mathcal{F}_1} \cap G_{\mathcal{F}_2}$ is isotopically connected then the intersection $\mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2$ is a foliation.*

Proof. (1) In fact, the distribution of $\mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2$ is then integrable.

(2) Denote by $\mathcal{IG}$ the set of all isotopies in G . Clearly, $\mathcal{I}(G_1 \cap G_2) = \mathcal{IG}_1 \cap \mathcal{IG}_2$ for arbitrary $G_1, G_2 \in \mathfrak{G}^r(M)$. For $x \in M$, set $\mathcal{IG}(x) := \{y \in M : (\exists f \in \mathcal{IG})(\exists t \in I) y = f_t(x)\}$. By definition, $L_x = \mathcal{IG}(x)$, where $L_x \in \mathcal{F}_G$ is a leaf meeting x . Therefore, since G_1, G_2, G are isotopically connected we have $L_x = \mathcal{IG}(x) = \mathcal{IG}_1(x) \cap \mathcal{IG}_2(x) = L_x^1 \cap L_x^2$, where $L_x^i \in \mathcal{F}_{G_i}, i = 1, 2$.

(3) Set $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2$ and $G = G_{\mathcal{F}}$. Use Prop. 2.4.

(4) In view of Prop. 2.4 we have $\mathcal{F}_{G_{\mathcal{F}_0}} = \mathcal{F}_0$ for all $\mathcal{F}_0 \in \mathfrak{F}^r(M)$. Put $G = G_{\mathcal{F}_1} \cap G_{\mathcal{F}_2}$. Therefore, in view of (2), $\mathcal{F}_1 \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}_{G_{\mathcal{F}_1}} \bar{\cap} \mathcal{F}_{G_{\mathcal{F}_2}} = \mathcal{F}_G$ is a foliation. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{F}_1 \prec \cdots \prec \mathcal{F}_k$ be a flag structure on M and let $x \in M$. If $x \in L_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ we write $p_i(x) = \dim L_i$, $\bar{p}_i(x) = p_i(x) - p_{i-1}(x)$ ($i = 2, \dots, k$) and $q_i(x) = m - p_i(x)$.

Definition 2.7. A chart (U, φ) of M with $\varphi(0) = x$ is called a *distinguished chart* at x with respect to $\mathcal{F}_1 \prec \cdots \prec \mathcal{F}_k$ if $U = V_1 \times \cdots \times V_k \times W$ such that $V_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_1(x)}$, $V_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}_i(x)}$ ($i \geq 2$) and $W \subset \mathbb{R}^{q_k(x)}$ are open balls and for any $L_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ we have

$$\varphi(U) \cap L_i = \varphi(V_1 \times \cdots \times V_i \times l_i),$$

where $l_i = \{w \in V_{i+1} \times \cdots \times V_k \times W : \varphi(0, w) \in L_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Observe that actually the above φ is an inverse chart; following [16] we call it a chart for simplicity. Notice as well that in the above definition one need not assume that $\mathcal{F}_i$ is a foliation but only that it is a partition by weakly imbedded submanifolds; that $\mathcal{F}_i$ is a foliation follows then by definition.

Theorem 2.8. *Let $G_1 \leq \dots \leq G_k \leq \text{Diff}^r(M)$ be an increasing sequence of diffeomorphism groups of M . Then $\mathcal{F}_{G_1} \prec \dots \prec \mathcal{F}_{G_k}$ admits a distinguished chart at any $x \in M$.*

In fact, it is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 2 in [11].

Corollary 2.9. *Let $G_1 \leq \dots \leq G_k \leq \text{Diff}^r(M)$ and let (L, σ) be a leaf of $\mathcal{F}_{G_k}$. Then all G_i preserve L , and $\mathcal{F}_{G_1|L} \prec \dots \prec \mathcal{F}_{G_{k-1}|L}$ is a flag structure on L . Moreover, a distinguished chart at x for $\mathcal{F}_{G_1|L} \prec \dots \prec \mathcal{F}_{G_{k-1}|L}$ is the restriction to L of a distinguished chart at x for $\mathcal{F}_{G_1} \prec \dots \prec \mathcal{F}_{G_k}$.*

The following property of paracompact spaces is well-known.

Lemma 2.10. *If X is a paracompact space and $\mathcal{U}$ is an open cover of X , then there exists an open cover $\mathcal{V}$ starwise finer than $\mathcal{U}$, that is for all $V \in \mathcal{V}$ there is $U \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\text{star}^\mathcal{V}(V) \subset U$. Here $\text{star}^\mathcal{V}(V) := \bigcup \{V' \in \mathcal{V} : V' \cap V \neq \emptyset\}$. In particular, for all $V_1, V_2 \in \mathcal{V}$ with $V_1 \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset$ there is $U \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $V_1 \cup V_2 \subset U$.*

Proposition 2.11. *If $\mathcal{F} \in \mathfrak{F}^r(M)$ then $G_{\mathcal{F}} = \alpha(\mathcal{F})$ is factorizable.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{X}_c(M, \mathcal{F})$ be the Lie algebra of all compactly supported vector fields on M tangent to $\mathcal{F}$. Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between isotopies f_t in $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ and smooth paths X_t in $\mathfrak{X}_c(M, \mathcal{F})$ given by the equation

$$\frac{df_t}{dt} = X_t \circ f_t \quad \text{with} \quad f_0 = \text{id}.$$

Let $f = (f_t) \in \mathcal{IG}_{\mathcal{F}}$ and let X_t be the corresponding family in $\mathfrak{X}_c(M, \mathcal{F})$. By considering $f_{(p/m)t} f_{(p-1/m)t}^{-1}$, $p = 1, \dots, m$, instead of f_t we may assume that f_t is close to the identity.

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be an open cover of M . We choose a family of open sets, $(V_j)_{j=1}^s$, which is starwise finer than $\mathcal{U}$, and satisfies $\text{supp}(f_t) \subset V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_s$ for each t . Let $(\lambda_j)_{j=1}^s$ be a partition of unity subordinate to (V_j) , and let $Y_t^j = \lambda_j X_t$. We set

$$X_t^j = Y_t^1 + \dots + Y_t^j, \quad j = 1, \dots, s,$$

and $X_t^0 = 0$. Each of the smooth families X_t^j integrates to an isotopy g_t^j with support in $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_j$. We get the fragmentation

$$f_t = g_t^s = f_t^s \circ \dots \circ f_t^1,$$

where $f_t^j = g_t^j \circ (g_t^{j-1})^{-1}$, with the required inclusions

$$\text{supp}(f_t^j) = \text{supp}(g_t^j \circ (g_t^{j-1})^{-1}) \subset \text{star}(V_j) \subset U_{i(j)}$$

which hold if f_t is sufficiently small. Thus the group of isotopies of $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ is factorizable. Consequently, $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ itself is factorizable. $\square$

Remark 2.12. The identification α_M enables us to consider several new properties of foliations from $\mathfrak{F}^r(M)$. For instance, one can say that a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ is *perfect* if so is the corresponding diffeomorphisms group $G_{\mathcal{F}} = \alpha_M(\mathcal{F})$. As we mentioned before it is known that $G_{\mathcal{F}} = \text{Diff}_c^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0$ is perfect provided $\mathcal{F}$ is regular and $1 \leq r \leq \dim \mathcal{F}$ or $r = \infty$ ([9], [19], [10]). It is not known whether $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ is perfect for singular foliations and a possible proof seems to be very difficult. In turn, a possible perfectness of $G_{\mathcal{F}} = \text{Diff}_c^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0$ with r large is closely related to the simplicity of $\text{Diff}_c^{n+1}(M^n)_0$, see [4].

Likewise, one can consider *uniformly perfect* or *bounded* foliations by using the corresponding notions for groups, see [14] and references therein.

Finally consider the following important feature of subclasses of the class $\mathfrak{F}^r(M)$, depending also on M and r . A subclass $\mathfrak{K}$ of $\mathfrak{F}^r(M)$ is called *faithful* if the following holds: For all $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathfrak{K}$ and for any group isomorphism $\Phi : \alpha_M(\mathcal{F}_1) \cong \alpha_M(\mathcal{F}_2)$ there is a C^r foliated diffeomorphism $\varphi : (M, \mathcal{F}_1) \cong (M, \mathcal{F}_2)$ such that $\forall f \in \alpha_M(\mathcal{F}_1)$, $\Phi(f) = \varphi \circ f \circ \varphi^{-1}$. From reconstruction results of Rybicki [12] and Rubin [8] it is known that the class of regular foliations of class C^∞ , $\mathfrak{F}_{reg}^\infty(M)$, is faithful.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1 AND 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First observe that the fact that a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ has no proper minimal set is equivalent to the statement that all leaves of $\mathcal{F}$ are dense.

($\Rightarrow$) Assume that $\emptyset \neq L \subset M$ is a proper closed saturated subset of M . Choose $x \in M \setminus L$. We prove the following statement:

(*) there are a ball $U \subset M \setminus L$ with $x \in U$ and $g \in [G_U, G_U]$ such that $g(x) \neq x$.

We are done in view of (*) by setting $H := \{g \in [G, G] : g|_L = \text{id}_L\}$. To prove (*), choose balls U and V in M such that $x \in V \subset \bar{V} \subset U$. Take $f \in G$ such that $f(x) \neq x$. In light of the assumption, for $\mathcal{U} = \{U, \bar{V}\}$ we may write $g = g_r \dots g_1$, where all g_i are supported in elements of $\mathcal{U}$. Let $s := \min\{i \in \{1, \dots, r\} : \text{supp}(g_i) \subset U \text{ and } g_i(x) \neq x\}$. Then $g_s \in G_U$ satisfies $g_s(x) \neq x$.

Now take an open W such that $x \in W \subset U$ and $g_s(x) \notin W$. Choose $f \in G_W$ with $f(x) \neq x$ by an argument similar to the above. It follows that $f(g_s(x)) = g_s(x) \neq g_s(f(x))$ and, therefore, $[f, g_s](x) \neq x$. Thus $g = [f, g_s]$ satisfies the claim.

($\Leftarrow$) First observe the following commutator formulae for all $f, g, h \in G$

$$(3.1) \quad [fg, h] = f[g, h]f^{-1}[f, h], \quad [f, gh] = [f, g]g[f, h]g^{-1}.$$

Next, in view of a theorem of Ling [5] we have that $[G, G]$ is a perfect group, that is

$$(3.2) \quad [G, G] = [[G, G], [G, G]].$$

Suppose that H is a nontrivial normal subgroup of $[G, G]$. Let $x \in M$ satisfy $h(x) \neq x$ for some $h \in H$. Fix a ball U_0 such that $h(U_0) \cap U_0 = \emptyset$. By the definition of $\mathcal{F}_{[G, G]}$ and the assumption that each leaf $L \in \mathcal{F}_{[G, G]}$ is dense, for every $y \in M$ there are a ball U_y with $y \in U_y$ and $f_y \in [G, G]$ such that $f_y(U_y) \subset U$. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_y\}_{y \in M}$.

Due to Lemma 2.10 we can find an open cover $\mathcal{V}$ starwise finer than $\mathcal{U}$. We denote $\mathcal{U}^G = \{g(U) \mid U \in \mathcal{U}, g \in [G, G]\}$ and

$$G^{\mathcal{U}} = \prod_{U \in \mathcal{U}^G} [G_U, G_U].$$

By assumption G is factorizable with respect to $\mathcal{V}$. First we show that $[G, G] \subset G^{\mathcal{U}}$, i.e. that any $[g_1, g_2] \in [G, G]$ can be expressed as a product elements of $G^{\mathcal{U}}$ of the form $[h_1, h_2]$, where $h_1, h_2 \in G_U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}^G$. In view of (3.1) and (3.2) we may assume that $g_1, g_2 \in [G, G]$. Now the relation $[G, G] \subset G^{\mathcal{U}}$ is an immediate consequence of (3.1) and the fact that $\mathcal{V}$ is starwise finer than $\mathcal{U}$.

Next we have to show that $G^{\mathcal{U}} \subset H$. It suffices to check that for every $f, g \in G_U$ with $U \in \mathcal{U}$ the bracket $[f, g]$ belongs to H . This implies that for every $f, g \in G_U$ with $U \in \mathcal{U}^G$ one has $[f, g] \in H$, since H is a normal subgroup in $[G, G]$.

We have fixed $h \in H$ and U_0 such that $h(U_0) \cap U_0 = \emptyset$. If $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and $f, g \in G_U$, take $k \in [G, G]$ such that $k(U) \subset U_0$, and put $\bar{f} = kfk^{-1}$, $\bar{g} = kgk^{-1}$. It follows that $[h\bar{f}h^{-1}, \bar{g}] = \text{id}$. Therefore, $[\bar{f}, \bar{g}] = [[h, \bar{f}], \bar{g}] \in H$, and we have also that $[f, g] \in H$. Thus we have $G^{\mathcal{U}} \subset H$ and, consequently, $[G, G] \leq H$, as required. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By assumption and Prop. 2.11 $\text{Diff}^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0$ is factorizable and non-fixing. Since $\text{Diff}^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0$ is isotopically connected, the first assertion follows from Theorem 1.1. The second assertion is a consequence of theorems stating that $\text{Diff}^r(M, \mathcal{F})_0$ is perfect ([9] and [19] for $r = \infty$, and [6] and [10] for $1 \leq r \leq \dim \mathcal{F}$). $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Banyaga, *The structure of classical diffeomorphism groups*, Mathematics and its Applications, 400, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1997.
- [2] P. Dazord, A. Lichnerowicz, C.M. Marle, *Structure locale des variétés de Jacobi*, J. Math. Pures et Appl. 70(1991), 101-152.
- [3] R.D. Edwards, R.C. Kirby, *Deformations of spaces of imbeddings*, Ann. Math. 93 (1971), 63-88

- [4] J. Lech, T. Rybicki, *Groups of $C^{r,s}$ -diffeomorphisms related to a foliation*, Banach Center Publ.; vol. 76 (2007), 437-450.
- [5] W. Ling, *Factorizable groups of homeomorphisms*, Compositio Mathematica, 51 no. 1 (1984), p. 41-50.
- [6] J. N. Mather, *Commutators of diffeomorphisms*, Comment. Math. Helv. I 49 (1974), 512-528; II 50 (1975), 33-40; III 60 (1985), 122-124.
- [7] P. Molino, *Riemannian Foliations*, Progr. Math. 73, Birkhäuser, 1988.
- [8] M. Rubin, *A reconstruction theorem for smooth foliated manifolds*, Geometriae Dedicata (2011), online 7 June 2010.
- [9] T. Rybicki, *The identity component of the leaf preserving diffeomorphism group is perfect*, Monatsh. Math. 120 (1995), 289-305.
- [10] T. Rybicki, *Commutators of C^r -diffeomorphisms acting along leaves*, Differential Geometry and Applications, August 1995, Brno; Proc. Conf., Masaryk Univ. (1996), 299-307.
- [11] T. Rybicki, *A note on generalized flag structures*, Ann. Pol. Math. LXIX (1998), 89-97.
- [12] T. Rybicki, *Isomorphisms between leaf preserving diffeomorphism groups*, Soochow J. Math. 22(1996), 525-542.
- [13] T. Rybicki, *Commutators of contactomorphisms*, Advances in Math. 225(2010), 3291-3326.
- [14] T. Rybicki, *Boundedness of certain automorphism groups of an open manifold*, Geometriae Dedicata (2011), online 6 August 2010; available at arXiv 0912.4590v3.
- [15] P. Stefan, *Accessability and foliations with singularities*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 80(1974), 1142-1145.
- [16] P. Stefan, *Accessible sets, orbits and foliations with singularities*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 29(1974), 699-713.
- [17] H. J. Sussmann, *Orbits of families of vector fields and integrability of distributions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 180(1973), 171-188.
- [18] W. Thurston, *Foliations and groups of diffeomorphisms*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 80 (1974), 304-307.
- [19] T. Tsuboi, *On the group of foliation preserving diffeomorphisms*, (ed. P. Walczak et al.) Foliations 2005, World scientific, Singapore (2006), 411-430.
- [20] I. Vaisman, *Lectures on the Geometry of Poisson Manifolds*, Progress in Math. 118, Birkhäuser 1994.
- [21] R. Wolak, *Basic forms for transversely integrable singular Riemannian foliations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 128(2000), 1542-1545.

FACULTY OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, AGH UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, AL. MICKIEWICZA 30, 30-059 KRAKÓW, POLAND
E-mail address: tomasz@agh.edu.pl